federal register

TUESDAY, APRIL 29, 1975
WASHINGTON, D.C.
Volume 40 ■ Number 83
PART III

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

■

APPROVAL AND PROMULGATION OF IMPLEMENTATION PLANS

Air Quality Standards

TITLE 40—PROTECTION OF ENVIRONMENT

Chapter I—Environmental Protection Agency

SUBCHAPTER C—AIR PROGRAMS

[FRL 341-1]

PART 52—APPROVAL AND PROMULGATION OF IMPLEMENTATION PLANS

Maintenance of National Ambient Air Quality Standards

On July 10, 1974, the Administrator proposed in the FEDERAL REGISTER (39 FR 25330), a list of areas that have the potential for violation of specified national ambient air quality standards by 1985 for all States except those in EPA's Region V (Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, and Wisconsin). In the FEDERAL REGISTER of August 12, 1974 (39 FR 28906), the Administrator proposed a similar list for the Region V States. The identification of these "air quality maintenance areas" (AQMAs) is required under 40 CFR 51.12 (e) and (f), published in the FEDERAL REGISTER of June 18, 1973 (38 FR 15834) and subsequently amended on May 8, 1974 (39 FR 16343). The preamble to the July 10, 1974, proposal contains detailed background information concerning the Administrator's proposed identification of these areas and their relationship to the implementation planning process; the reader is referred to that preamble for this information.

The action below presents the final identification of AQMAs for the States of Alabama, Alaska, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Louisiana, Maine, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Texas, Vermont, and Washington, and for Guam, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands, and American Samoa. Also, this action presents a partial AQMA list for Iowa.

The Administrator is taking the following actions on these States: (a) Approval of the supplemental information that the States submitted to the Administrator under 40 CFR 51.12(e) and which the Administrator has determined to be adequate and in accordance with EPA's Guidelines for Designation of Air Quality Maintenance Areas, which information contains either the list of areas identified by the States or a justification why there are no such areas.

(b) Disapproval of plans for which States did not submit adequate supplemental information containing either a list of areas identified pursuant to 40 CFR 51.12(e) or a justification why there are no such areas.

(c) Identification of areas that have the potential for violation of a national standard by 1985. In some cases, such identifications include, where applicable, the Administrator's own area identification, in addition to the areas identified by the States and approved by the Administrator. Where the Administrator disapproves a State's plan because of an inadequate submittal, the Administrator either identifies AQMAs or indicates that there are no such areas under 40 CFR 51.12 (e) and (f).

The Administrator is reviewing the AQMA lists submitted by the other States and will publish lists for those States at a later time, along with the remainder of the AQMAs for Iowa. These AQMA lists are being published later than the August 16, 1974, date for publication specified in the May 8, 1974, FEDERAL REGISTER notice referred to above because the task of area identification provided to be more difficult and time-consuming than had previously been anticipated. The Administrator regrets the delay but believes that a more appropriate list of AQMAs will result from the additional time and effort expended.

For the areas identified by the Administrator under 40 CFR 51.12 (e) and (f), the States are required to submit a detailed analysis of the impact on air quality of projected growth. Where the analysis indicates that the national air quality standards will not be maintained, the States must also submit plans containing measures to ensure maintenance of national standards during the ensuing 10-year period. The AQMA identification-analysis-plan development procedure must be repeated at least every 5 years to ensure continuing maintenance of national standards.

The Administrator has prepared and distributed to the States the available volumes in a series of guidelines to assist the States in identifying AQMAs, performing their AQMA analyses, and developing their AQMA plans. These are the Guidelines for Air Quality Maintenance Planning and Analysis. The constituent volumes include:

Volume 1—Designation of Air Quality Maintenance Areas (Revised)
Volume 2—Plan Preparation
Volume 3—Control Strategies
Volume 4—Land Use and Transportation Considerations
Volume 5—Case Studies in Plan Development
Volume 6—Overview of Air Quality Maintenance Area Analysis
Volume 7—Projecting County Emissions
Volume 8—Computer-Assisted Area Source Emissions Gridding Procedure
Volume 9—Evaluating Indirect Sources
Volume 10—Reviewing New Stationary Sources
Volume 11—Air Quality Monitoring and Data Analysis
Volume 12—Applying Atmospheric Simulation Models to Air Quality Maintenance Areas
Volume 13—Allocating Projected Emissions to Sub-County Areas.

EPA issued an earlier version of Volume 1 to the States in January 1974; the revised version merely incorporates the errata and supplments to the earlier version. This document describes techniques for the States to use in identifying potential problem areas. Additional volumes in this guidelines series may be issued as the need arises. The Guidelines documents may be inspected at any of EPA's Regional Offices and at the Freedom of Information Center, EPA, 401 M Street SW., Washington, D.C. 20460. The documents can also be obtained for a nominal fee from the National Technical Information Service, 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, Virginia 22151. The Administrator will propose revisions to 40 CFR Part 51 concerning the detailed requirements for preparation, adoption, and submission of AQMA analyses and plans at a later time.

All States were required, prior to the submission of identified areas, to conduct one or more public hearings on the AQMA identification and technical supporting material. Where a State held no such hearing, the Administrator has held a hearing on this matter.

In addition to soliciting public comment on the list of proposed AQMAs, the Administrator, acting through his Regional Administrators, forwarded a copy of the proposed AQMA list to the Governors of States for which AQMAs were proposed under Office of Management and Budget's (OMB) Circular A-95, Part IV (published in the FEDERAL REGISTER of November 28, 1973, 38 FR 32874) which requires that:

> Prior to the designation or redesignation (or approval thereof) of any planning and development district or region under any Federal program, Federal agency procedures will provide a period of 30 days for the Governor(s) of the State(s) in which the district or region will be located to review the boundaries thereof and comment upon its relationship to planning and development districts or regions established by the State.

Frequently, the boundaries of AQMAs will not conform to sub-State planning and development districts because of the general lack of confinement of air pollution problems to such districts.

INTERSTATE AQMAS

EPA's Guidelines for Designation of Air Quality Maintenance Areas state:

> The AQMA should include all of the territory which shares a common air envelope and a common aggregation of sources. This will usually be an urbanized area plus some adjoining areas which are now undeveloped but which are expected to develop in the next 10 years or so. It may include satellite communities which are now separated from the central urbanized area but will, in 10-20 years, become part of the central urbanized area and thus share the air resource.

If an "air envelope" that has the potential for failing to maintain a national standard within 10 years is an interstate area, the Administrator has designated the area as an "interstate AQMA." Under the forthcoming proposed air quality maintenance requirements in 40 CFR 51, the agency responsible for implementing national standards in any portion of an interstate AQMA would have to furnish any available data (with the exception of confidential source-specific parameters) on emissions, air quality, control strategy development, growth projections, and AQMA plan development to other State or local agencies having similar responsibilities in other portions of the AQMA.

COMMENTS ON PROPOSED AQMA DESIGNATION

Under the description of actions being taken on individual States below, the Administrator indicates the nature of comments received and provides a response. The Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc. (NRDC), commented about aspects of EPA's air quality maintenance program that are not specific to individual States, however, so the Administrator will respond to these comments separately.

First, NRDC criticized the basic approach of 40 CFR 51.12, which requires that new maintenance measures be developed only in those areas designated as AQMAs. NRDC argued that such a scheme would violate section 107 of the Clean Air Act, which requires that each State have a plan that provides for maintenance "within each air quality control region in such State."

The scheme of 40 CFR 51.12 is fully consistent with section 107. The new measures that will be developed in accordance with the AQMA plan process will be supplements to implementation plans that already have State-wide measures designed to assist in ensuring air quality maintenance. Every plan is required to have stationary and indirect source review regulations which are applicable on a State-wide basis. Both the Federal Motor Vehicle Control Program and the New Source Performance Standards will also help ensure maintenance of the ambient standards throughout each State. The approach of requiring supplemental maintenance measures only for those areas that have been analyzed to have the potential for violating the standards is, in the Administrator's judgment, entirely rational and fully defensible from a legal viewpoint. The Administrator recognizes that air pollution control agencies have limited financial and manpower resources and does not feel it would be prudent to divert such resources from critical areas to areas that have only remotely possible problems.

NRDC also criticized the emphasis on analysis of Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas (SMSAs) contained in EPA's Guidelines for Designation of Air Quality Maintenance Areas. NRDC pointed out that non-SMSA areas may also present a potential for violating the standards.

It was not EPA's intent to foreclose the consideration of non-SMSAs. EPA emphasized SMSA analysis in the Guidelines under the assumption that in the lesser-developed areas of the country, the maintenance provisions that are applicable State-wide (such as the new source review procedures and the others mentioned above) would generally suffice. It was therefore EPA's intent that SMSAs be considered as a minimum.

Since States may not have fully considered non-SMSA areas in the designation process, however, the Administrator intends to propose, in amendments to 40 CFR 51 concerning air quality maintenance, an additional requirement that each State plan contain a procedure for monitoring land development in all areas of the State. When an area has undergone or is expected to undergo an amount of growth to the extent that the area has the potential for violation of a standard over the subsequent 10-year period, the State would then be required to designate the area as an AQMA. When the Administrator officially publishes the area as an AQMA, the area would then be subject to the air quality maintenance requirements for analysis and plan development under § 51.12. All areas of the State, AQMAs as well as non-AQMA areas, would be subject to the proposed development monitoring regulations since a significant amount of development in an AQMA might jeopardize a standard for a pollutant for which that AQMA was not designated. The Administrator will develop guidance that States may follow in establishing such a procedure.

Finally, whenever the Administrator discovers that any area of a State fails to maintain an air quality standard after attainment, he will call for a plan revision to include whatever additional measures as may be necessary to ensure maintenance of the standards.

The proposed regulations would also require a procedure to monitor continuously, for each area of the State (possibly by county), parameters that are indicative of growth and development such as population, housing and building starts, employment, and earnings. For States that already have their own system for tracking various kinds of development, the Administrator encourages those States to incorporate their systems into the proposed development tracking procedure.

The Administrator wishes to emphasize that this proposed new requirement for tracking growth and development will not require any kind of permit system. It would not be intended as a system to conduct pre-construction review of individual developments but merely as a device to be used to refine the designation of AQMAs. The Administrator will invite comments on this requirement at the time he proposes it.

NRDC also contends that the 10-year analysis period required under 40 CFR 51.12 is arbitrary and inadequate and that EPA should require detailed projections of anticipated activity over a minimum of 20 years. At present, there are limitations in accuracy inherent in projecting emissions and air quality. Thus it is the Administrator's judgment that a 10-year analysis and planning period should be the minimum requirement for AQMAs, at least until more accurate emission and air quality projection techniques are developed that would make longer projection periods more feasible. The Administrator encourages States to consider in their AQMA analyses and plans the effects of development over periods longer than 10 years if adequate data concerning such development is available and of a sufficient reliability and if there is a reasonable degree of confidence in the techniques used to project emissions and air quality.

NRDC alleges that the initial exclusion criteria for carbon monoxide and photochemical oxidants in EPA's Guidelines for Designation of Air Quality Maintenance Areas excuse any area from developing a maintenance plan merely upon a showing that the standards for these pollutants will be attained by 1985, although the Clean Air Act requires attainment no later than 1975 or, with a two-year extension, 1977.

Both the CO and the oxidant exclusion criteria were based on the assumption that the existing State implementation plans, including the transportation control strategies, would be sufficient to attain the national ambient air quality standards by at least 1977. This assumption, although implicit, was not actually stated in the Guidelines document. Any growth in vehicle usage between 1977 and 1985 would then be countered by the replacement of older vehicles by newer vehicles that would meet the Federal motor vehicle emission control standards of section 202 of the Clean Air Act. Where it is shown that a plan is unable to attain the air quality standards by the attainment date, EPA may call for a plan revision under section 110(a)(2)(H) of the Clean Air Act calling for such measures as may be necessary to ensure the attainment and maintenance of the national standards.

NRDC also questions the representativeness of automobile emission factors used in the Guidelines for Designation of Air Quality Maintenance Areas. The initial designation criteria and the methods used to project emissions made use of the automobile emission factors in Compilation of Air Pollution Emission Factors (EPA document AP–42, Second Edition, April 1973). Data from EPA's testing of in-use vehicles indicate that the CO emission rates from 1972 model year vehicles are higher than emissions predicted by AP–42.[1] The data presented in the Guidelines document were the best available to EPA at that time; the data from EPA's testing program were not available at the time of publication of the Guidelines document because the test program was incomplete.

NRDC referred to vehicle emission data from 1972–1974 model years gathered in Houston, Texas, as indicative of actually measured emission rates versus rates predicted by AP–42. The data to which NRDC referred, however, was raw data and, as yet, unverified as to accuracy. Vehicles from five other cities besides Houston were tested in this testing program, and only a relatively small population of vehicles were tested in each. Furthermore, the data from three of the six cities has not yet been summarized. Because of these uncertainties, it is the Administrator's position that it is not statistically valid to draw even tentative conclusions at this time regarding emissions for an entire class of vehicles from the results in one test city. Where the Administrator discovers that a substantial number of any class or category of vehicles or engines do not conform to EPA's emission limitations, he may notify the manufacturer of those vehicles of the nonconformity and require the manufacturer to submit a plan to correct the nonconformity under the terms provided in section 207(c) of the Act.

---

[1] Williams, Marcia E., et al. Automobile Exhaust Emission Surveillance-Analysis of the FY 72 Program. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Air and Water Programs, Office of Mobile Source Air Pollution Control, Certification and Surveillance Division, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48105. February 1974. (EPA–460/2–74–001.)

NRDC also argued that tampering with automobile emission control devices and the use of "defeat devices" (which inactivate emission control systems in cold weather) were not taken into account and therefore AP–42 emission factors would further underestimate future automobile emissions. EPA is revising AP–42 concerning highway vehicle emissions. A draft copy of preliminary revisions has been circulated to EPA's Regional Offices and State air pollution control agencies. The revisions reflect not only results of in-use vehicle test programs but also data on catalyst-equipped vehicles (prototype and certification vehicles). Although the results to be published in AP–42 do not reflect effects due to "defeat devices," they do reflect "tampering" with control systems of in-use vehicles. Ford Motor Company, the only automobile manufacturer that employed such devices, stopped using those devices two-thirds of the way through their 1973 production year. It is the Administrator's judgement that the increase in emissions from the total motor vehicle population due to the defeat devices is not significant.

NRDC argued that motor vehicle emission factors in AP–42, which are based on the federal emission test procedure, fail to account for problems in locations where "cold-starts" of vehicles predominate, such as center-city streets in the afternoon rush hours. NRDC states that the cold-start effect is exacerbated by the low ambient temperatures experienced during winter in many major cities and that the federal test procedure ignores such temperatures, resulting in an underestimation of emissions in downtown areas that experience such low temperatures. It is true that the emission factors do not reflect the impact of low ambient temperature cold start emissions. They do, however, reflect cold starts at higher ambient temperatures, since they are based on results of the federal test procedures,[2] and thus are not as inaccurate as NRDC implies. The Administrator has been aware of the impact of variation in ambient temperature on the magnitude and duration of cold-start emissions. Assessing this problem is not simple since the trend toward fast-acting chokes and uncertainty in designs of future engines can substantially alter the problem's impact. EPA is currently analyzing emission data on cold starts at low ambient temperatures and will incorporate such data into AP–42 at the conclusion of this analysis.

Also, the current version of AP–42 does not account for the fact that emission standards for carbon monoxide and hydrocarbons have been suspended for another two years: one year (to 1977) as a result of the enactment of the Energy Supply and Environmental Coordination Act (ESECA) of 1974 and another year (to 1978) as a result of the Administrator's granting of a discretionary suspension, which is permitted under ESECA. EPA is revising AP–42 to account for these delays.

The emission factors that will appear in the revised AP–42 include the most reliable data currently available on deterioration of emission control devices. For future model year vehicles, the determination of the effect of deterioration still requires estimation, since the gathering of truly representative deterioration data requires a statistically developed test program of in-use vehicles. This is obviously impossible to do for vehicles that have not yet been designed, let alone manufactured.

The Administrator expects the States to use the revised AP–42 emission factors, when available, for the development of AQMA analyses and plans. The revised emission factors are also to be used for developing analyses and, where necessary, plans for areas that are designated as AQMAs by the Administrator in the future.

The Administrator does not intend the AQMA identifications below to be irrevocable. New air quality data, changes in emission factors resulting from suspensions of automobile emission standards, better emission projection techniques, and other factors may cause the Administrator to require the States to re-evaluate the identified AQMAs and other areas. Such re-evaluation may lead to additions or deletions of areas or pollutants or changes in area boundaries.

Summary of State Actions

The Administrator is taking action on 21 State plans in the rulemaking below. He is approving 14 State plans under the air quality maintenance provisions of 40 CFR 51.12(e) and disapproving 3. The action does not affect 4 plans in States without SMSAs, and the Administrator does not identify any AQMAs in these 4 States. A total of 43 AQMAs are being identified for at least one pollutant. Of these, 39 are identified for particulate matter, 14 for sulfur dioxide, 3 for carbon monoxide, 11 for photochemical oxidants, and none for nitrogen dioxide.

A discussion of specific actions relating to each State is presented below.

Alabama

On April 4, 1974, the Administrator received a report from the Alabama Air Pollution Control Commission identifying three areas in the State—Birmingham, Gadsden and Mobile—as AQMAs. A public hearing on the contents of the report was held by the State in Montgomery on May 8, 1974, and the Alabama Air Pollution Control Commission, Division of Air Pollution Control, officially submitted their identifications on June 17, 1974. The Administrator proposed a list of AQMAs in the Federal Register of July 10, 1974 (39 FR 25330). No comments were received on this proposal. EPA has reviewed the materials submitted by the State and is approving the identifications as submitted.

The State submission and EPA's technical support documentation may be inspected at the office of the Alabama Air Pollution Control Commission, 645 South McDonough Street, Montgomery, Alabama 36104, and at the office of EPA Region IV, 1421 Peachtree, St. NE., Atlanta, Georgia 30309.

Information as to other locations in the State where the report may be reviewed is available from both of the above offices.

Alaska

The State of Alaska did not provide information to the Administrator for the identification of AQMAs in Alaska. Therefore, EPA carried out the necessary analysis; no areas with a potential for exceeding national ambient air quality standards were identified. EPA held a public hearing on July 17, 1974, in Anchorage, Alaska, at which time EPA's proposal not to designate any AQMAs was discussed. No public comments were received either as a result of the public hearing or the notice of proposed rulemaking published on July 10, 1974 (39 FR 25330).

EPA's analysis of emission data and growth factors for the Anchorage Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area and the Fairbanks, Alaska, urban area indicated that particulate standards may be exceeded in 1985, but only because of fugitive dust from natural sources. Carbon monoxide standards in Fairbanks are expected to be maintained if the federally promulgated transportation control plan is implemented because the Federal Motor Vehicle Emission Control Program is expected to more than offset any growth in emissions due to growth in vehicle-miles travelled. After discounting the effects of fugitive dust and taking account of the anticipated impact of the control strategy for achieving the secondary particulate standard, the Administrator has determined that additional maintenance provisions for the Alaska implementation plan will not be necessary at this time. Technical support material relevant to this determination is available for public inspection at the EPA, Region X Office, 1200 Sixth Avenue, Seattle, Washington 98108.

Georgia

On May 17, 1974, the Administrator received the official AQMA identification material for the State of Georgia from the Georgia Department of Natural Resources, Environmental Protection Division. The Atlanta and Savannah areas were identified as AQMAs. A public hearing on this material was held by the State in Atlanta on April 25, 1974.

In the Federal Register of July 10, 1974 (39 FR 25330), the Administrator identified as AQMAs not only those areas identified by the State, but also Catoosa and Walker Counties as part of the Chattanooga Interstate AQMA. No comments were received on this proposal. EPA has reviewed all AQMA identification materials and is approving the identifications as submitted, and is also identifying the Georgia portion of the Chattanooga Interstate area as discussed above.

The State submission and EPA's technical support documentation on which these identifications are based, are available for public inspection at the office of the Air Quality Control Section, En-

[2] 40 CFR Part 85—Control of Air Pollution from New Motor Vehicles and New Motor Vehicle Engines.

vironmental Protection Division, Georgia Department of Natural Resources, 19 Hunter Street, S.W., Atlanta, Georgia 30334, and at the office of EPA Region IV, 1421 Peachtree St. NE., Atlanta, Georgia 30309.

Information as to other locations where the designation material may be reviewed is available from both of the above offices.

HAWAII

The State of Hawaii has taken no action to identify AQMAs, and therefore, the Administrator, based on an analysis performed according to the Guidelines for Designation of Air Quality Maintenance Areas, proposed the identification of the City and County of Honolulu as an AQMA for particulate matter in the FEDERAL REGISTER of July 10, 1974 (39 FR 25330).

A public hearing was conducted by EPA on the proposed identifications on August 20, 1974 in Honolulu. Testimony was presented that questioned the growth factors used by EPA to project emissions of particulate matter. Growth factors based on a source-by-source study of emissions were presented that indicated a lower growth rate. These growth factors have been accepted by EPA as superior to the Bureau of Economic Analysis projection parameters used by EPA in making the original analysis. A recalculation of the projected ambient particulate concentration for 1985, using the lower growth factors presented at the public hearing, indicates that the national ambient air quality standards will be maintained through 1985. On the basis of this determination, the Administrator does not identify any AQMAs in Hawaii. Copies of the hearing record and the technical support document are available for inspection during normal business hours at the Office of EPA, Region IX, located at 100 California Street, San Francisco, California 94111, and the Pacific Islands Office, U.S. EPA, 1000 Bishop Street, Suite 601, Honolulu, Hawaii 96813.

IDAHO

The State of Idaho determined that there were no areas within the State with a potential for exceeding national ambient air quality standards through 1985. The State analysis of emissions data and growth factors indicated that particulate standards may be exceeded in 1985, but this would be due to fugitive dust from natural sources. After discounting the effects of natural fugitive dust and taking account of the anticipated impact of the existing programmed control strategy for achieving the secondary particulate standard, the State determined that additional maintenance provisions for the Idaho implementation plan will not be necessary at this time; hence no AQMAs were proposed for designation by the State.

The States' findings were subject to a public hearing on June 3, 1974, in Boise, Idaho. The State's recommendations were submitted to EPA on June 11, 1974 by the Idaho Department of Environmental and Community Services. No public comments were received either as a result of the State public hearing or the Federal notice of proposed rulemaking published on July 10, 1974 (39 FR 25330).

EPA has reviewed the State submittal and concurs with the State analysis. Documentation of this review and concurrence is presented in technical support material available for public inspection at the EPA, Region X Office, 1200 Sixth Avenue, Seattle, Washington 98108.

IOWA

On June 7, 1974, the Administrator received AQMA identification material for the State of Iowa from the Governor's Office. A public hearing was held by the State in Des Moines on April 24, 1974.

The Administrator proposed to approve the State's identification on July 10, 1974 (39 FR 25330). Copies of the identification material were made available for public inspection at EPA's regional office in Kansas City, Missouri, and at the office of the Iowa Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) in Des Moines, Iowa.

Written comments were solicited from the public. One comment submitted stated that Polk County, which contains Des Moines, should not be identified as an AQMA for carbon monoxide. This comment was based on the conclusion that quantitative estimates of air quality based on the Guidelines for Designation of Air Quality Maintenance Areas were below the air quality standards. The State identification material agreed with this conclusion; however, the DEQ did not believe that certain growth factors were adequately taken into account in the methods presented in the guidelines. Upon identification of Polk County for CO, the DEQ will conduct more detailed projects of ambient air quality to determine if a problem exists. If further analysis indicates that the ambient air quality standard for carbon monoxide will be maintained, then no plan will be developed pursuant to 40 CFR 51.12(g).

Another comment stated that the AQMAs proposed for identification do not fit the State-established planning and development districts. However, as was noted in that comment, Part IV of OMB Circular A-95 allows for the provision of clear justification for not conforming to State designated planning and development districts. The fact that air pollution problems are by nature not confined to specific areas clearly justifies not identifying these AQMAs in conformity with sub-State planning and developing districts.

After review of the State's submittal, the Administrator is hereby approving the State's identification of three areas in the State as AQMAs.

The identifications of Council Bluffs, Davenport and Dubuque as potential interstate AQMAs are being withheld temporarily pending further review of adjacent areas in the bordering states. The State submittal and EPA's technical support documentation are available for public inspection at the office of the Iowa Department of Environmental Quality, 3920 Delaware Avenue, P.O. Box 3326, Des Moines, Iowa 50316, and at the office of EPA, Region VII, 1735 Baltimore Avenue, Kansas City, Missouri 64108.

LOUISIANA

The State of Louisiana did not submit a list of identified AQMAs to EPA. The Louisiana Air Control Commission held public hearings in Lake Charles, Baton Rouge, and New Orleans during the period of June 4–6, 1974. On June 6, 1974, the Commission concluded that no air quality maintenance areas would be identified. This action reportedly was based on an analysis which covered air sampling data, growth factors, compliance schedule improvements, and other related factors. Because no official submission of AQMA material was made under § 51.12(e) of this chapter, the Administrator is disapproving the State plan.

Consequently, EPA made an analysis of the SMSAs in Louisiana in accordance with the guidelines for designation and proposed identification of three areas in the FEDERAL REGISTER of July 10, 1974 (39 FR 25330). The Baton Rouge and New Orleans areas were proposed for photochemical oxidants on the basis of high oxidant concentrations, projected growth to 1985, and indications that there was significant transport of oxidants between the two areas. The Shreveport area was proposed for particulate matter on the basis of concentrations exceeding a national standard in 1972 and the projection that such standard would be exceeded also in 1985.

A public hearing was held by EPA in New Orleans on August 15, 1974. Testimony was presented that questioned the identification of the Shreveport area as an AQMA. High particulate readings from one air sampler were said to be affected unduly by a municipal incinerator located nearby. However, when an older unit at this incinerator was shut down, particulate concentrations were still sufficiently high that the annual primary and secondary standards were exceeded for 1974 through August. New emissions data submitted by the State were not sufficiently complete to be useful in new projections. Thus, the identification of the Shreveport area for particulate matter is made in this promulgation. The comprehensive analysis to follow should allow the State to determine the main sources of particulate matter and the control strategies available to bring concentrations within the secondary standard during the 1975–1985 period.

Following the hearing, the State submitted revised emissions data on hydrocarbons for the Baton Rouge and New Orleans areas. Ambient air quality data on oxidants previously submitted by the State, which had been used by EPA in its projections, were found to be invalid by the State. Also, testimony by the State indicated that high oxidant readings in neither of these cities are associated with wind direction from the other. The revised emissions and ambient data have

now been utilized by EPA in making another analysis of these areas with reference to photochemical oxidants. In EPA's judgment identification for oxidants is not required for each area.

EPA has carefully reviewed its analysis, the record of the public hearing of August 15, and all comments sent directly to the Regional Office. All of these have been evaluated and considered in making the official identification herein.

The analysis and submittal of the State, as well as EPA's technical support documentation are available for inspection during normal business hours at the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region VI, Air Program Branch, 1600 Patterson Street, Dallas, Texas 75201 and at the Louisiana Health and Human Resources Administration, Air Control Division, State Office Building, New Orleans, Louisiana 70160. A copy of the transcript of the public hearing held by EPA, and other comments received, are also available for inspection at the U.S. EPA Region VI Office.

Maine

On April 16, 1974, the Administrator received from Maine an unofficial submittal indicating that the Portland and Lewiston-Auburn SMSAs were evaluated following the EPA guidelines and that no potential violation of a national ambient air quality standard within the next 10 year period was found. The Governor of Maine officially submitted an AQMA proposal on June 26, 1974, which was substantially unchanged from the unofficial submittal of April 16, 1974. Because Maine did not formally submit this material to EPA in time for the publication on July 10, 1974, of the proposed list of AQMAs, the Administrator proceeded with his own evaluation of the two areas. As a result of the Administrator's evaluation, the list of AQMAs proposed in the Federal Register of July 10, 1974 (39 FR 25330), also indicated no need for AQMA designation for Maine. No comments were received pertaining to that proposed rulemaking. Therefore, the Administrator is not identifying any areas as AQMAs in the State of Maine. The State submittal and the technical support documentation upon which this action is based are available for public inspection during normal business hours at the Department of Environmental Protection, Bureau of Air Quality Control, Vickery-Hill Building, Chapel Street, Augusta, Maine 04330, and the offices of EPA, Region I, John F. Kennedy Federal Building, Boston, Massachusetts 02203.

Mississippi

On March 14, 1974, the Administrator received AQMA identification material from the Mississippi Air and Water Pollution Control Commission, Division of Air Pollution Control. A public hearing was held by the State in Jackson on April 25, 1974. The State evaluated the Jackson, Gulfport and Biloxi areas and determined that none of these areas present the potential for a violation of a national ambient air quality standard within 10 years. The Administrator proposed that no AQMAs should be identified for Mississippi in the Federal Register of July 10, 1974 (39 FR 25330). In the one comment received during the 30-day comment period, the Governor concurred in the proposal to not identify any AQMAs in the State. EPA has reviewed the identification material and is approving the material as submitted.

The State submittal and EPA's technical support documentation on which this action is based are available for public inspection at the office of the Division of Air Pollution Control, Mississippi Air and Water Pollution Control Commission, Robert E. Lee Building, Sixth Floor, E. Griffith and N. Lamar Streets, Jackson, Mississippi 39205, and at the office of EPA Region IV, 1421 Peachtree St., N.E., Atlanta, Georgia 30309.

Information as to other locations where the designation material may be reviewed is available from both of the above offices.

North Carolina

On April 1, 1974, the Administrator received AQMA identification material for the State of North Carolina from the North Carolina Department of Natural and Economic Resources, Division of Environmental Management, proposing to identify the Asheville, Charlotte-Gastonia, Greensboro, Raleigh-Durham, and Winston-Salem areas as AQMAs. A public hearing was held by the State in Raleigh on March 20, 1974. The Administrator proposed the State-submitted list of AQMAs in the Federal Register of July 10, 1974 (39 FR 25330). In the one comment received, the Governor indicated that Durham County was inadvertently omitted from the proposed identifications although the State submittal indicated that Durham County should have been included.

On November 22, 1974, the North Carolina Department of Natural and Economic Resources, Division of Environmental Management, submitted additional material deleting the Asheville and Raleigh-Durham AQMAs and removing Gaston County from the Charlotte-Gastonia AQMA (which is now being called the Charlotte AQMA). In EPA's judgment these deletions are justified because monitoring data originally used for AQMA identification were unduly influenced by major sources that will be controlled. Recalculation of projected air quality indicates that 1985 concentrations in these areas will not violate the national ambient air quality standards. The Administrator is approving the identifications as submitted and modified by the State.

The State submittals and technical support documentation on which this action is based are available for public inspection at the office of the Division of Environmental Management, North Carolina Department of Natural and Economic Resources, Post Office Box 27687, 216 West Jones Street, Raleigh, North Carolina 27611, and at the office of EPA Region IV, 1421 Peachtree St., NE., Atlanta, Georgia 30309.

Information as to other locations where the identification material may be reviewed is available from both of the above offices.

Oklahoma

The State of Oklahoma did not submit to the EPA a formal list of AQMA identifications prior to the July 10, 1974 (39 FR 25330), proposal. However, the July 10, 1974, action proposed AQMAs which were under consideration by Oklahoma. Oklahoma held hearings for AQMA designations in Tulsa on May 21, 1974, and in Oklahoma City on May 31, 1974.

The only comment received in the Regional office on the EPA-proposed identifications of AQMAs in Oklahoma was from the Association of Central Oklahoma Governments (ACOG). This comment expressed continuing support for identification of the area of the Central Oklahoma AQMA as presented by the State at the public hearing in Oklahoma City on May 31, 1974, namely, the modified area of the "central urban boundary," as defined by ACOG. The position of ACOG on this point was emphasized to the State at the public hearing. Because of the irregular and complex boundaries involved, and the lengthy legal description, EPA proposed an area with more regular boundaries, which presumably would facilitate the required analysis of air quality and expected growth in the area; EPA is identifying this area as proposed.

On July 30, 1974, the Governor of Oklahoma notified EPA of his concurrence with the identification of the Tulsa AQMA and the Central Oklahoma AQMA as proposed by EPA, with two exceptions. The first of these originated from the fact that the Oklahoma State Department of Health had performed an extensive review of air quality data for the Central Oklahoma Air Quality Control Region (which includes the proposed Central Oklahoma AQMA) and had found no violations of national ambient air quality standards for SO_2 in 1972. The original data used by the State in its submittal was apparently in error. A subsequent analysis performed by Oklahoma to project SO_2 concentrations for 1985, using the correct air quality values, indicated that the air quality standards for SO_2 would not be exceeded through 1985. The second exception consisted of correcting a clerical error in the description of the Central Oklahoma AQMA which resulted in only a part of the City of Norman being included. After an investigation of the validity of these two exceptions, EPA has, in the action below identified AQMAs differently from the July 10, 1974, proposal to take account of these comments.

The Governor's July 30, 1974, communication constituted an official submittal of identifications of AQMAs by Oklahoma. In view of this, a public hearing on the proposed identifications, which had been scheduled to be held by EPA in Oklahoma City, was cancelled. It is the Administrator's determination that the State has followed proper procedures in making its submittal, and the two State hearings met the requirements

to provide opportunity for public comment.

The Environmental Protection Agency has carefully reviewed the identifications of AQMAs as submitted by the State of Oklahoma and has prepared its own analysis. All comments made at the State public hearings as well as that submitted directly to the Regional Office have been evaluated and considered in making the official identifications herein. The Administrator is approving the State submittal and providing an official list of AQMAs for Oklahoma. The analysis and submittal of the State, as well as EPA's technical support documentation, are available for inspection at the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region VI, Air Program Branch, 1600 Patterson Street, Dallas, Texas 75201, during regular working hours and at the following other locations:

Air Quality Service
Oklahoma State Department of Health
NE. 10th and Stonewall
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73105

Air Quality Section
Oklahoma City-County Health Department
921 NE. 23rd Street
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73105

Air Pollution Control Division
Tulsa City-County Health Department
4616 East 15th Street
Tulsa, Oklahoma 74112

OREGON

The State of Oregon identified the urbanizing portions of the following Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas in Oregon as possible AQMAs:

1. Portland, Oregon-Vancouver, Washington (Columbia Region Association of Governments, 1970 Portland-Vancouver Metropolitan Transportation Study Area) and

2. Eugene-Springfield, Oregon (Eugene-Springfield Urban Service Area).

The State also identified the urbanizing portion of Jackson County, identified as the Bear Creek Valley Land Use Planning Area, as a possible AQMA. This planning area includes the cities of Medford and Ashland.

In addition, the Oregon submittal identified the Longview-Kelso, Washington—St. Helens, Oregon interstate area as a possible AQMA. However, prior to Washington's public hearing on AQMAs, agreement was reached by Oregon and Washington not to officially identify this area as a distinct AQMA. Instead, Oregon and Washington decided to conduct comprehensive studies of the entire Portland - Vancouver - Longview interstate area and, if necessary, develop a control strategy for maintenance of standards for the Longview-Kelso area as part of the Portland-Vancouver AQMA.

The State of Oregon's findings were subject to public hearings on April 12, 1974, in Portland, Oregon, and on April 15, 1974, in Eugene, Oregon. The State's identifications were submitted to EPA on May 1, 1974, by the Department of Environmental Quality and a supplement to those identifications was submitted on September 16, 1974. The EPA has reviewed the State analysis and concurs with the State identifications. The basis for this concurrence is presented in technical support documentation available for public inspection at the EPA, Region X Office, 1200 Sixth Avenue, Seattle, Washington 98108.

No public comments were received either as a result of the State public hearing or the Federal notice of proposed rulemaking published on July 10, 1974, (39 FR 25330). Comments received from the Governor were in support of the designated areas as originally proposed. This action reflects no substantive change from the proposed action. It is noted, however, that the boundaries of the AQMAs subject to this rulemaking are now defined in terms of specific planning areas rather than by a listing of political jurisdictions as was done in the proposal.

RHODE ISLAND

On April 11, 1974, the Administrator received AQMA identifications for the State of Rhode Island from the Rhode Island Department of Health. A public hearing was held on this submittal by the State on April 10, 1974. EPA proposed the AQMAs submitted by the State in the FEDERAL REGISTER of July 10, 1974 (39 FR 25330). After review of the State's submittal, the Administrator is approving the State's identification of the Metropolitan Providence area, as modified by a letter from Governor Noel dated September 6, 1974, as an AQMA for the specified pollutants. The State submittal and technical support documentation upon which this approval is based are available for public inspection at the offices of EPA, Region I, John F. Kennedy Federal Building, Boston, Massachusetts 02203, and the offices of the Division of Air Pollution Control, Room 204, Health Building, Providence, Rhode Island 02908. Comments were received from the Governor's office pertaining to the July 10, 1974, proposed rulemaking publication of this designation in the FEDERAL REGISTER. It was recommended by the Governor's office and upon consideration, agreed to by the Administrator, that the following cities and towns be added to the AQMA because of anticipated levels of population concentration and industrial development: Coventry, Cumberland, East Greenwich, Johnston, Lincoln, Middleton, Newport, North Kingstown, North Smithfield, Portsmouth, Smithfield, Tiverton, West Warwick, and Woonsocket. The city of Providence was left out of the July 10, 1974, proposed rulemaking due to a typographical error and has been added to the designated area.

SOUTH CAROLINA

On March 22, 1974, the Administrator received AQMA identification material for the State of South Carolina from the South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control, Bureau of Air Quality Control, proposing to designate the Charleston and Greenville areas as AQMAs.

A public hearing was held by the State in Columbia on March 20, 1974. The Administrator proposed as AQMAs the areas submitted by the State in the FEDERAL REGISTER of July 10, 1974 (39 FR 25330). The one comment received on the proposal was from the Governor, who indicated that the boundaries of the Air Quality Maintenance Areas proposed in the July 10, 1974, FEDERAL REGISTER did not conform to the boundaries as delineated in the State submittal. Accordingly, the descriptions of the areas identified herein have been changed to correspond with those of the State-identified areas; these areas include portions of Greenville County and contiguous portions of Charleston and Berkeley Counties. EPA is approving the State's AQMA identifications as submitted.

The State submittal and EPA's technical support documentation on which this action is based are available for public inspection at the office of the Bureau of Air Quality Control, South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control, 2600 Bull Street, Columbia, South Carolina 29211, and the office of EPA Region IV, 1421 Peachtree St., NE., Atlanta, Georgia 30309.

Information as to other locations where the designation material may be reviewed is available from both of the above offices.

TEXAS

The Governor of the State of Texas officially submitted a list of identified AQMAs to EPA on May 30, 1974. This followed seven State public hearings held on the identifications in the cities of Austin, Beaumont, Corpus Christi, Dallas, El Paso, Houston, and San Antonio on April 10 and 11, 1974. Five areas were identified as AQMAs, four of these for particulate matter and one area for particulate matter and sulfur dioxide. The State did not make any identifications for photochemical oxidants, pointing out that the State's transportation control plans, upon which the AQMA identification criteria were based, were then involved in litigation between the State and EPA.

In the EPA proposal of July 10, 1974, all of the State designations were included. Also, the following additions and changes were made: (1) The Beaumont, Corpus Christi, Dallas-Fort Worth, Houston-Galveston, El Paso, San Antonio, and Austin areas were proposed as AQMAs for photochemical oxidants on the basis that transportation control plans had been promulgated for these areas or that it was deemed that a photochemical oxidant control strategy was required; (2) sulfur dioxide was listed for the El Paso area on the basis that very high concentrations of sulfur dioxide had been measured in the vicinity of a nonferrous smelter; (3) the Houston and Galveston areas were combined into a single AQMA because it was thought that any problems of sulfur dioxide in the two areas were interrelated, and because a transportation control plan had been promulgated for the entire region.

Four public hearings on the complete proposal of designations of AQMAs in Texas were held by EPA in the cities of Dallas, El Paso, San Antonio, and Hous-

ton during the period of August 16–22, 1974. Written comments were also received directly in the Regional Office. All of these comments have been evaluated and considered in arriving at the official designations promulgated below. Those comments which have resulted in major changes to the proposed package are discussed in the following paragraphs.

The State and other organizations have contended that the Houston and Galveston areas should not be combined into a single AQMA. Testimony was given that, although sulfur dioxide emissions in the Houston area are about four times those of the Galveston area, ambient concentrations of sulfur dioxide in Houston do not show violations of standards. (However, the land area of the Houston SMSA is approximately 16 times that of the Galveston SMSA). Additionally, it was claimed that because of wind direction and other factors, emissions of sulfur dioxide in Houston do not ordinarily affect Galveston, although conflicting testimony indicated a strong probability of wind-borne transport of emissions. EPA received opposition from the State, the County of Galveston, the Houston Chamber of Commerce, and several local governments in the region to the combining of the Houston and Galveston areas into one AQMA on the grounds that the Houston area does not have to be identified as an AQMA for SO_2, but the Galveston area does. EPA has therefore considered the matter and concluded that the areas should be separated. Consequently the Houston area is being designated for particulate matter and photochemical oxidants, and the Galveston area is being designated for particulate matter, photochemical oxidants and sulfur dioxide. Each of these areas consists of a complete SMSA.

The State and representatives of the smelters (American Smelting and Refining Company, ASARCO) presented testimony in opposition to the designation of El Paso County for sulfur dioxide. The testimony indicated that the violation of the air quality standard was caused by one source, and the State was presently developing a revised control strategy and regulation limiting emissions from that source. Thus, the designation of El Paso County does not include sulfur dioxide because it is more appropriate to develop a control strategy for the one plant than to develop a control strategy for the entire area through an air quality maintenance plan.

EPA has re-examined the proposed AQMA identifications for photochemical oxidants in the light of a recent court decision. Based upon this re-examination, the Administrator is not identifying the Austin area as an AQMA for photochemical oxidants. If the Administrator discovers, based upon further investigation, that this area has the potential for failing to maintain the national standard for photochemical oxidants, he will identify this area as an AQMA.

According to a report performed under contract for EPA, no additional oxidant control measures are necessary for Corpus Christi; present stationary source regulations and Federal motor vehicle controls are expected to provide sufficient reduction of emissions of hydrocarbons for attainment by 1975 and maintenance thereafter through 1985. Thus, the Corpus Christi area is not being identified for photochemical oxidants.

The Administrator approves the State's submittal with the addition of photochemical oxidant as a designated pollutant for the following AQMAs: Beaumont, Dallas-Fort Worth, El Paso, Galveston, Houston, and San Antonio.

The analysis and submittal of the State as well as EPA technical support documentation are available for inspection during normal business hours at the U.S. EPA, Region VI, Air Programs Branch, 1600 Patterson Street, Dallas, Texas 75201, and the Texas Air Control Board, 8520 Shoal Creek Blvd., Austin, Texas 78758. Copies of the transcript of the public hearings held by EPA and other comments received are also available for inspection at the U.S. EPA Region VI office.

Vermont

The State of Vermont did not submit any material to EPA that identifies AQMAs. The EPA document, Guidelines for Designation of Air Quality Maintenance Areas, however, required that States consider, as a minimum, the SMSAs within their jurisdiction. Since the State of Vermont does not contain any SMSAs, Vermont did not submit any material concerning AQMAs, and in Administrator does not identify any areas under § 51.12, paragraphs (e) and (f), of this chapter as having the potential for violation of national ambient air quality standards within 10 years. No comments were received pertaining to the July 10, 1974, proposed rulemaking of this action in the FEDERAL REGISTER.

Washington

The State of Washington identified the urbanizing portions of the following Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas in Washington as possible AQMAs:

1. Seattle-Everett and Tacoma, Washington (Washington State Department of Highways Seattle Tacoma Urban Area—1972).

2. Spokane, Washington (Spokane Regional Planning Conference Study Area).

3. Portland, Oregon-Vancouver, Washington (Columbia Region Association of Governments 1970 Portland-Vancouver Metropolitan Transportation Study Area).

The State's findings were subject to a public hearing on May 29, 1974, in Lacey, Washington. The State's adopted identifications were submitted to EPA on May 31, 1974, by the Washington Department of Ecology.

EPA has reviewed the State analysis and concurs with the State identifications. The basis for this concurrence is presented in the technical support documentation available for public inspection at the EPA, Region X Office, 1200 Sixth Avenue, Seattle, Washington 98108.

No public comments were received either as a result of the State public hearing or the Federal notice of proposed rulemaking published on July 10, 1974 (39 FR 25330). Comments received from the Governor supported the boundaries of the designated areas as published in the EPA proposal. This action reflects no substantive changes from the proposed action. It is noted however that the boundaries of the AQMAs addressed by this rulemaking are now defined in terms of specific planning areas rather than by a listing of political jurisdictions as was done in the proposal.

Guam

Guam did not submit any material to EPA that identifies AQMAs. The EPA document, Guidelines for Designation of Air Quality Maintenance Areas, however, required that States consider, as a minimum, the SMSAs within their jurisdiction. Since Guam does not contain any SMSAs, Guam did not submit any material concerning AQMAs, and the Administrator does not identify any areas pursuant to § 51.12, paragraphs (e) and (f), of this chapter as having the potential for violation of national ambient air quality standards within 10 years. No comments were received pertaining to the July 10, 1974, proposed rulemaking of this action in the FEDERAL REGISTER.

Puerto Rico

On July 10, 1974 (39 FR 25330), the Administrator proposed a list of four areas in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico for AQMA identification. These areas were determined to have the potential for violating particulate matter standards during the period of 1975–1985. The Administrator's proposal was based on a May 5, 1974, submission from the Governor of Puerto Rico. The proposed AQMAs were the subject of a Puerto Rico Environmental Quality Board (EQB) public hearing on April 18, 1974. The Administrator approves Puerto Rico's submission but is adding other areas and pollutants to the AQMA list for Puerto Rico. The Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC) has presented detailed comments concerning the EPA proposal that affected the Administrator's AQMA identification. These comments are answered below.

Because of a lack of adequate data upon which to base its AQMA identifications, EPA employed a contractor to determine whether any additional areas should be identified. The contractor's task involved a detailed analysis of the four Standard Metropolitan Statistiscal Areas (SMSAs) in Puerto Rico to determine which areas should be identified as AQMAs.

Several monitoring stations had been operating throughout the San Juan and Ponce SMSAs for the calendar year of 1970. However, there were no stations existing in Mayaguez or Caguas for that period. For this reason, EPA used air pollution dispersion models and a 1970 emission inventory to compute 1970 air quality levels for the Mayaguez and Caguas SMSAs. In addition, the Ponce sulfur dioxide air quality was estimated by modeling since no monitoring stations

for that pollutant were located there in 1970. In reviewing the results of the dispersion model for Caguas, Mayaguez and Ponce, it is the Administrator's opinion that the values predicted by the contractor for 1970 underestimate the actual air quality concentration.

After predicting ambient air concentrations for the four SMSAs, a proportional ("roll-forward") technique was applied by the contractor to arrive at 1975 and 1985 air quality. For Caguas and Mayaguez, particulate matter concentrations are expected to increase by approximately three times between 1970 and 1985. It is the Administrator's belief that, even though air quality levels are predicted to be below the national standard for these two SMSAs, further detailed analysis should be performed because of the paucity of air quality data. As a result, the Administrator has determined that these two SMSAs should be identified as AQMAs for particulate matter and be subject to further intensive review and analysis.

Growth in emissions of sulfur oxides are expected in the San Juan and Ponce SMSAs according to data developed by the contractor. Therefore, the Administrator has determined that these areas should also be identified as AQMAs for sulfur oxides.

The areas of Guayanilla and Peneulas are areas of high industrial activity and have been identified as AQMAs for particulate matter. The lack of adequate air quality data for sulfur dioxide should not preclude their identification for sulfur oxides; because of the high degree of industrialization in these areas and the current and projected growth rate of sulfur oxide emissions, the Administrator has concluded that Guayanilla and Peneulas should also be identified as AQMAs for sulfur oxides.

NRDC suggested that the Administrator identify as AQMAs for sulfur oxides the areas of Guanica and Dorado. Upon review of these areas, the Administrator concurs with the position taken by NRDC and this notice contains the identification of Guanica and Dorado as AQMAs for sulfur oxides. Additional material submitted by NRDC shows that, in the vicinity of the municipalities of Utuado, Lares, and Adjuntas, extraction of copper through open pit mining will occur. It is expected that particulate emissions from the extraction process will approach 2,600 tons/day. In addition, the smelting process will cause the emission of approximately 80 tons/day of sulfur dioxide. Based on this information, the Administrator has determined that the potential situation in these municipalities clearly dictates a need to identify these municipalities as air quality maintenance areas for both particulate matter and sulfur oxides.

NRDC has also brought to the Administrator's attention the fact that location approvals have been granted for the construction of large heavy industrial parks in six municipalities. The municipalities are: Yabucoa, Guyama, Punta-Cabillon, Barceloneto, Arecibo, and Aguadillo. The Administrator has concluded that there exists a potential for violation of ambient air quality standards due to the planned industrialization of these areas, and, consequently, this notice identifies all of the above mentioned municipalities as air quality maintenance areas for both particulate matter and sulfur oxides.

The technical support documentation supports the above-mentioned identifications and the Administrator's technical judgments; the State submittal and technical support documentation are available for review during normal business hours at the offices of EPA Region II, 26 Federal Plaza, Room 908, New York, N.Y. 10007.

U.S. Virgin Islands

The U.S. Virgin Islands did not submit any material to EPA that identifies AQMAs. The EPA document, Guidelines for Designation of Air Quality Maintenance Areas, however, required that States consider, as a minimum, the SMSAs within thier jurisdiction. Since the U.S. Virgin Islands does not contain any SMSAs, the Virgin Islands did not submit any material concerning AQMAs, and the Administrator does not identify any areas under § 51.12, paragraphs (e) and (f), of this chapter as having the potential for violation of national ambient air quality standards within 10 years. No comments were received pertaining to the July 10, 1974, proposed rulemaking of this action in the Federal Register.

American Samoa

American Samoa did not submit any material to EPA that identifies AQMAs. The EPA document, Guidelines for Designation of Air Quality Maintenance Areas, however, required that States consider, as a minimum, the SMSAs within their jurisdiction. Since American Samoa does not contain any SMSAs, American Samoa did not submit any material concerning AQMAs, and the Administrator does not identify any areas under § 51.12, paragraphs (e) and (f), of this chapter as having the potential for violation of national ambient air quality standards within 10 years. No comments were received pertaining to the July 10, 1974, proposed rulemaking of this action in the Federal Register.

Availability of State Submittals and Technical Support Documentation

State submittals and technical support documentation (including the Administrator's evaluation of State-submitted AQMA material) for the list of AQMAs will be available for public inspection during normal business hours at the Freedom of Information Center, EPA, Room 206, 401 M Street, SW., Washington, D.C. 20460, and at each of the Regional Offices listed below. Each Regional Office will have only the material for the States within its respective region.

Region	States	Address
I	Maine, Rhode Island, Vermont.	John F. Kennedy Federal Bldg., Room 2303, Boston, Mass. 02203.
II	Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands.	26 Federal Plaza, New York, N.Y. 10007.
IV	Alabama, Georgia, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina.	1421 Peachtree St. NE., Atlanta, Ga. 30309.
VI	Louisiana, Oklahoma, Texas.	1600 Patterson St., Suite 1100, Dallas, Tex. 75201.
VII	Iowa	1735 Baltimore Ave., Kansas City, Mo. 64108.
IX	Hawaii, American Samoa, Guam.	100 California St., San Francisco, Calif. 94111.
X	Alaska, Idaho, Oregon, Washington.	1200 6th Ave., Seattle, Wash. 98101.

The Administrator finds good cause for making this rulemaking effective immediately in order that the affected States may begin at once to develop detailed air quality maintenance area analyses and plans if they have not already begun to do so.

(Secs. 110, 301(a), Clean Air Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1857c-5, 1857g(a)).)

Dated: April 22, 1975.

Russell E. Train,
Administrator.

Part 52 of Chapter I, Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations is amended as follows:

Subpart B—Alabama

§ 52.50 [Amended]

1. Section 52.50 is amended by inserting the date "June 17, 1974" in proper chronological order in paragraph (c)(2).

2. Subpart B is amended by adding § 52.59 as follows:

§ 52.59 Maintenance of national standards.

(a) The areas listed below which were identified by the State of Alabama are hereby identified by the Administrator pursuant to § 51.12, paragraphs (e) and (f), of this chapter as having the potential for violation of the specified air quality standards within 10 years. The identified areas consist of the territorial area encompassed by the boundaries of the given jurisdictions or described area including the territorial area of all municipalities (as defined in section 302(f) of the Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. 1857h(f)) geographically located within the outermost boundaries of the area so delimited.

(1) Birmingham Air Quality Maintenance Area.

(i) Pollutant for which the area is identified: Particulate matter.

(ii) Geographical composition of area:

Jefferson County.
Walker County.

(2) Gadsden Air Quality Maintenance Area.

(i) Pollutant for which the area is identified: Particulate matter.

(ii) Geographical composition of area:

Etowah County.

(3) Mobile Air Quality Maintenance Area.

(i) Pollutant for which the area is identified: Particulate matter.

(ii) Geographical composition of area:

Mobile County.

Subpart C—Alaska

3. Subpart C is amended by adding § 52.95 as follows:

§ 52.95 Maintenance of national standards.

(a) The requirements of § 51.12(e) of this chapter are not met because the State neither identified areas of the State which have the potential for violation of the national air quality standards within 10 years nor provided a justification that there are no such areas in the State.

(b) Pursuant to the requirements of § 51.12 (e) and (f) of this chapter, the Administrator has determined that there are no areas in the State having the potential for violation of the national ambient air quality standards within 10 years.

Subpart L—Georgia

4. Section 52.570 is amended by adding a new paragraph (c) (4) as follows:

§ 52.570 Identification of plan.

* * * * *

(c) * * *

(4) May 17, 1974, by the Director of the Environmental Protection Division of the Georgia Department of Natural Resources.

5. Subpart L is amended by adding § 52.580 as follows:

§ 52.580 Maintenance of national standards.

(a) The areas listed below are hereby identified by the Administrator pursuant to § 51.12, paragraphs (e) and (f), of this chapter as having the potential for violation of the specified air quality standards within 10 years. The identified areas consist of the territorial area encompassed by the boundaries of the given jurisdictions or described area including the territorial area of all municipalities (as defined in section 302(f) of the Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. 1857h(f)) geographically located within the outermost boundaries of the area so delimited.

(1) Atlanta Air Quality Maintenance Area.

(i) Pollutant for which the area is identified: Particulate matter.

(ii) Geographical composition of area:

Clayton County
Cobb County
De Kalb County
Fulton County
Gwinnett County

(2) Savannah Air Quality Maintenance Area.

(i) Pollutant for which the area is identified: Particulate matter.

(ii) Geographical composition of area:

Chatham County

(3) Chattanooga Interstate Air Quality Maintenance Area (Georgia Portion).

(i) Pollutant for which the area is identified: Particulate matter.

(ii) Geographical composition of area:

Catoosa County
Walker County

Subpart M—Hawaii

6. Subpart M is amended by adding § 52.631 as follows:

§ 52.631 Maintenance of national standards.

(a) The requirements of § 51.12(e) of this chapter are not met because the State neither identified areas of the State that have the potential for violation of the national air quality standards within 10 years nor provided a justification that there are no such areas in the State.

(b) Pursuant to the requirements of § 51.12 (e) and (f) of this chapter, the Administrator has determined that there are no areas in the State having the potential for violation of the national ambient air quality standards within 10 years.

Subpart N—Idaho

7. Section 52.670 is amended by adding paragraph (c) (3) as follows:

§ 52.670 Identification of plan.

* * * * *

(c) * * *

(3) June 11, 1974, by the Idaho Department of Environmental and Community Services.

8. Subpart N is amended by adding § 52.682 as follows:

§ 52.682 Maintenance of national standards.

(a) Pursuant to the requirements of § 51.12, paragraphs (e) and (f), of this chapter, the Administrator, in agreement with the State of Idaho, has identified no areas that have the potential for violation of the national ambient air quality standards within 10 years.

Subpart Q—Iowa

§ 52.820 [Amended]

9. Section 52.820 is amended by inserting the date "June 7, 1974," in chronological order in paragraph (c) (2).

10. Subpart Q is amended by adding § 52.832 as follows:

§ 52.832 Maintenance of national standards.

(a) The areas listed below which were identified by the State of Iowa are hereby identified by the Administrator pursuant to § 51.12, paragraphs (e) and (f), of this chapter as having the potential for violation of the specified air quality standards within ten years. The identified areas consist of the territorial area encompassed by the boundaries of the given jurisdictions or described area including the territorial area of all municipalities (as defined in section 302(f) of the Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. 1857h(f)) geographically located within the outermost boundaries of the area so delimited.

(1) Cedar Rapids Air Quality Maintenance Area.

(i) Pollutant for which the area is identified: Particulate matter.

(ii) Geographical composition of area:

Linn County.

(2) Des Moines Air Quality Maintenance Area.

(i) Pollutants for which the area is identified: Carbon monoxide and particulate matter.

(ii) Geographical composition of area:

Polk County.

(3) Waterloo Air Quality Maintenance Area.

(i) Pollutant for which the area is identified: Particulate matter.

(ii) Geographical composition of area:

Black Hawk County.

Subpart T—Louisiana

11. Subpart T is amended by adding § 52.982 as follows:

§ 52.982 Maintenance of national standards.

(a) The requirements of § 51.12(e) of this chapter are not met because the State neither identified areas of the State which have the potential for violation of air quality standards within ten years nor provided a justification that there are no such areas in the State.

(b) The area listed below is hereby identified by the Administrator pursuant to § 51.12 (e) and (f) of this chapter as having the potential for violation of a national ambient air quality standard within 10 years. The identified area consists of the territorial area encompassed by the boundaries of the given jurisdictions or described area including the territorial area of all municipalities (as defined in section 302(f) of the Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. 1857h(f)) geographically located within the outermost boundaries of the area so delimited.

(1) Shreveport Air Quality Maintenance Area.

(i) Pollutant for which the area is identified: Particulate matter.

(ii) Geographical composition of area:

Bossier Parish
Caddo Parish
Webster Parish

Subpart U—Maine

12. Section 52.1020 is amended by adding paragraph (c) (3) as follows:

§ 52.1020 Identification of plan.

* * * * *

(c) * * *

(3) June 26, 1974.

13. Subpart U is amended by adding § 52.1028 as follows:

§ 52.1028 Maintenance of national standards.

(a) Pursuant to the requirements of § 51.12, paragraphs (e) and (f), of this chapter, the Administrator, in agreement with the State of Maine, has identified no areas that have the potential for violation of the national ambient air quality standards within 10 years.

Subpart Z—Mississippi

14. In § 52.1270, paragraph (c) (2) is revised to read as follows:

§ 52.1270 Identification of plan.

* * * * *

(c) * * *

(2) May 17, 1972, March 6, 1973, and March 14, 1974.

15. Subpart Z is amended by adding § 52.1279 as follows:

§ 52–1279 Maintenance of national standards.

(a) Pursuant to the requirements of § 51.12, paragraphs (e) and (f), of this chapter, the Administrator, in agreement with the State of Mississippi, has identified no areas that have the potential for violation of the national ambient air quality standards within 10 years.

Subpart II—North Carolina

§ 52.1770 [Amended]

16. Section 52.1770 is amended by inserting the dates April 1, and November 22, 1974, in proper chronological order in paragraph (c).

17. Subpart II is amended by adding § 52.1777 as follows:

§ 52.1777 Maintenance of national standards.

(a) The areas listed below which were identified by the State of North Carolina are hereby identified by the Administrator pursuant to § 51.12, paragraphs (e) and (f), of this chapter as having the potential for violation of the specified air quality standards within 10 years. The identified areas consist of the territorial area encompassed by the boundaries of the given jurisdictions or described area including the territorial area of all municipalities (as defined in section 302(f) of the Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. 1857h(f)) geographically located within the outermost boundaries of the area so delimited.

(1) Charlotte Air Quality Maintenance Area.

(i) Pollutant for which the area is identified: Particulate matter.

(ii) Geographical composition of area:

Mecklenburg County.

(2) Greensboro Air Quality Maintenance Area.

(i) Pollutant for which the area is identified: Particulate matter.

(ii) Geographical composition of area:

Guilford County.

(3) Winston-Salem Air Quality Maintenance Area.

(i) Pollutant for which the area is identified: Particulate matter.

(ii) Geographical composition of area:

Forsyth County.

Subpart LL—Oklahoma

§ 52.1920 [Amended]

18. Paragraph (c)(2) is amended by adding the date "July 30, 1974," in proper chronological sequence.

19. Subpart LL is amended by adding § 52.1927 as follows:

§ 52.1927 Maintenance of national standards.

(a) The areas listed below which were identified by the State of Oklahoma are hereby identified by the Administrator pursuant to § 51.12 (e) and (f) of this chapter as having the potential for violation of a national ambient air quality standard within 10 years. The identified areas consist of the territorial area encompassed by the boundaries of the given jurisdictions or described area including the territorial area of all municipalities (as defined in section 302(f) of the Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. 1857h(f)) geographically located within the outermost boundaries of the area so delimited.

(1) Central Oklahoma Air Quality Maintenance Area.

(i) Pollutants for which the area is identified: Particulate matter and photochemical oxidants.

(ii) Geographical composition of area:

Oklahoma County
That part of Canadian County east of Range 6W
That part of Cleveland County north of Township 7N.

(2) Tulsa Air Quality Maintenance Area.

(i) Pollutants for which the area is identified: Particulate matter and photochemical oxidants.

(ii) Geographical composition of area:

Tulsa County
That part of Rogers County south of Township 23N and west of Range 16E
That part of Wagoner County north of Township 17N and west of Range 16E
That part of Creek County north of Township 16N and east of Range 10E
That part of Osage County south of Township 23N and east of Range 10E.

Subpart MM—Oregon

20. Section 52.1970 is amended by revising paragraph (c) to read as follows:

§ 52.1970 Identification of plan.

* * * * *

(c) Supplemental information was submitted on:

(1) May 3 and October 26, 1972, and April 13 and September 21, 1973, and

(2) August 10, 1972, February 9, May 30, June 8, 22, and 25, July 17, and August 3, 20, and 27, 1973, and May 1, and September 16, 1974, by the Department of Environmental Quality.

21. Subpart MM is amended by adding § 52.1986 as follows:

§ 52.1986 Maintenance of national standards.

(a) The areas listed below, which were determined by the State of Oregon, are hereby identified by the Administrator pursuant to § 51.12, paragraphs (e) and (f), of this chapter as having the potential for violation of the specified air quality standards within 10 years. The identified areas consist of the territorial area encompassed by the boundaries of the given jurisdictions or described area including the territorial area of all municipalities (as defined in section 302(f) of the Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. 1857h(f)) geographically located within the outermost boundaries of the area so delimited.

(1) Portland-Vancouver Interstate Air Quality Maintenance Area (Oregon Portion).

(i) Pollutants for which the area is identified: Particulate matter, sulfur dioxide, carbon monoxide, and photochemical oxidants.

(ii) Geographical composition of area:

The Columbia Region Association of Governments 1970 Portland-Vancouver Metropolitan Transportation Study Area. (A complete geographical description of the area is presented in a map of the 1970 Portland-Vancouver Metropolitan Study Area prepared by the Columbia Region Association of Governments and available for inspection at the Freedom of Information Center, U.S. EPA, Room 206, 401 M Street SW., Washington, D.C.; the U.S. EPA Oregon Operations Office, 1234 SW. Morrison Street, Portland, Oregon; and the U.S. EPA Region X Office, 1200 Sixth Avenue, Seattle, Washington.)

(2) Eugene-Springfield Air Quality Maintenance Area.

(i) Pollutant for which the area is identified: Particulate matter.

(ii) Geographical composition of area:

Lane Regional Air Pollution Authority Control Area "C". (This area is defined in the Lane Regional Air Pollution Authority Rules and Regulations dated August 2, 1972, and available for inspection at the Freedom of Information Center, U.S. EPA, Room 206, 401 M Street SW., Washington, D.C.; the U.S. EPA Oregon Operations Office, 1234 SW. Morrison Street, Portland, Oregon; and the U.S. EPA Region X Office, 1200 Sixth Avenue, Seattle, Washington.)

(3) Medford-Ashland Air Quality Maintenance Area.

(i) Pollutant for which the area is identified: Particulate matter.

(ii) Geographical composition of area:

The Bear Creek Urban Regional Land Use Planning Area. (A complete geographical description of the area is presented in a map of the Bear Creek Urban Regional Land Use Planning Area prepared by the county engineer of Jackson County, Oregon (revised 1973) and is available for inspection at the Freedom of Information Center, U.S. EPA, Room 206, 401 M Street SW., Washington, D.C.; the U.S. EPA Oregon Operations Office, 1234 SW. Morrison Street, Portland, Oregon; and the U.S. EPA Region X Office, 1200 Sixth Avenue, Seattle, Washington.)

Subpart OO—Rhode Island

22. In § 52.2070, paragraph (c) is revised to read as follows:

§ 52.2070 Identification of plan.

* * * * *

(c) Supplemental information was submited on:

(1) February 9 and February 29, 1972, April 24, 1973, and April 11, 1974 by the Rhode Island Department of Health.

(2) September 6, 1974.

* * * * *

23. Subpart 00 is amended by adding § 52.2082 as follows:

§ 52.2082 Maintenance of national standards.

(a) The area listed below, which was identified by the State of Rhedoe Island, is hereby identified by the Administrator pursuant to § 51.12, paragraphs (e) and (f), of this chapter as having the potential for violation of the specified air quality standards within 10 years. The identified area consists of the territorial

area encompased by the boundaries of the given jurisdictions.

(1) Metropolitan Providence Air Quality Maintenance Area.

(i) Pollutants for which the area is identified: Particulate matter, sulfur dioxide, and photochemical oxidants.

(ii) Geographical composition of area:

In Kent County: the city of Warwick and the towns of Coventry, East Greenwich, and West Warwick.

In Newport County: the city of Newport and the towns of Middletown, Portsmouth and Tiverton.

In Providence County: the cities of Central Falls, Cranston, East Providence, Pawtucket, Providence, and Woonsocket; the towns of Cumberland, Johnson, Lincoln, North Providence, North Smithfield, and Smithfield.

In Washington County: the town of North Kingston.

Subpart PP—South Carolina

24. In § 52.2120, paragraph (c)(4) is revised to read as follows:

§ 52.2120 Identification of plan.

* * * * *

(c) * * *

(4) August 16, 1973, and March 14 and 22, 1974, by the South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control.

25. Subpart PP is amended by adding § 52.2129 as follows:

§ 52.2129 Maintenance of national standards.

(a) The areas listed below which were identified by the State of South Carolina are hereby identified by the Administrator pursuant to § 51.12, paragraphs (e) and (f), of this chapter as having the potential for violation of the specified air quality standards within 10 years. The identified areas consist of the territorial area encompassed by the boundaries of the given jurisdictions or described area including the territorial area of all municipalities (as defined in section 302(f) of the Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. 1857h(f)) geographically located within the outermost boundaries of the area so delimited.

(1) Charleston Air Quality Maintenance Area.

(i) Pollutant for which the area is identified: Particulate matter.

(ii) Geographical composition of area:

The contiguous portions of Charleston and Berkeley Counties lying within the boundary of a line described as follows: Starting at the intersection of U.S. 17 and Church Creek, and proceeding thence northward to the intersection of the Ashley River and the Dorchester County line, northeastward to the intersection of U.S. 52 and State Highway 9, eastward to the intersection of Durham Creek and West Branch Cooper River, southward along the Cooper River to Red Bank Landing, eastward to the town of Cainhoy, southward along State Highway 41 to its intersection with U.S. 17, and westward along U.S. 17 to and ending at Church Creek.

(2) Greenville Air Quality Maintenance Area.

(i) Pollutant for which the area is identified: Particulate matter.

(ii) Geographical composition of area:

The portion of Greenville County lying within the boundary of a line described as follows: Starting at the intersection of U.S. 25 By-Pass and State Highway 253, and proceeding thence northeastward along Highway 253 to the intersection with State Highway 46, southeastward to the intersection of State Highway 291 and U.S. 29, northeastward along U.S. 29 to the Greenville-Spartanburg County Line, southward along the County line for 2½ miles, southwestward in an arc paralleling U.S. 29 to an intersection with I-385, southeastward along I-385 to its intersection with I-85, southwestward along I-85 to its intersection with U.S. 25 By-Pass, and northwestward along U.S. 25 By-Pass to and ending at State Highway 253.

Subpart SS—Texas

§ 52.2270 [Amended]

26. Paragraph (c)(2) is amended by adding the date May 30, 1974 in proper chronological sequence.

27. Subpart SS is amended by adding § 52.2302 as follows:

§ 52.2302 Maintenance of national standards.

(a) The areas listed below are hereby identified by the Administrator pursuant to § 51.12 (e) and (f) of this chapter as having the potential for violation of the specified air quality standards within 10 years. The identified areas consist of the territorial area encompassed by the boundaries of the given jurisdictions or described area including the territorial area of all municipalities (as defined in section 302(f) of the Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. 1857(h)(f)) geographically located within the outermost boundaries of the area so delimited.

(1) Beaumont Air Quality Maintenance Area.

(i) Pollutants for which the area is identified: Particulate matter and photochemical oxidants.

(ii) Geographical composition of area:

Hardin County
Jefferson County
Orange County

(2) Corpus Christi Air Quality Maintenance Area.

(i) Pollutant for which the area is identified: Particulate matter.

(ii) Geographical composition of area:

Nueces County
San Patricio County

(3) Dallas-Fort Worth Air Quality Maintenance Area.

(i) Pollutants for which the area is identified: Particulate matter and photochemical oxidants.

(ii) Geographical composition of area:

Collin County
Dallas County
Denton County
Ellis County
Hood County
Johnson County
Kaufman County
Parker County
Rockwall County
Tarrant County
Wise County.

(4) Galveston Air Quality Maintenance Area.

(i) Pollutants for which the area is identified: Particulate matter, photochemical oxidants, and sulfur dioxide.

(ii) Geographical composition of area:

Galveston County.

(5) Houston Air Quality Maintenance Area.

(i) Pollutants for which the area is identified: Particulate matter and photochemical oxidants.

(ii) Geographical composition of area:

Brazoria County
Fort Bend County
Harris County
Liberty County
Montgomery County
Waller County.

(6) San Antonio Air Quality Maintenance Area.

(i) Pollutant for which the area is identified: Photochemical oxidants.

(ii) Geographical composition of area:

Bexar County
Comal County
Guadalupe County.

(7) El Paso Air Quality Maintenance Area.

(i) Pollutant for which the area is identified: Photochemical oxidants.

(ii) Geographical composition of area:

El Paso County.

Subpart UU—Vermont

28. Subpart UU is amended by adding § 52.2379 as follows:

§ 52.2379 Maintenance of national standards.

(a) Based upon the information available to him and in accordance with the EPA publication, Guidelines for Designation of Air Quality Maintenance Areas, the Administrator does not identify any areas pursuant to § 51.12, paragraphs (e) and (f), of this chapter as having the potential for violation of the national ambient air quality standards within 10 years.

Subpart WW—Washington

29. Section 52.2470 is amended by revising paragraph (c) to read as follows:

§ 52.2470 Identification of plan.

* * * * *

(c) Supplemental information was submitted on:

(1) January 28, May 5, July 19, and September 11, 1972, and February 15, April 13, and October 11, 1973, and

(2) December 12, 1972, July 31, 1973, and May 31, 1974, by the State of Washington Department of Ecology.

30. Subpart WW is amended by adding § 52.2496 as follows:

§ 52.2496 Maintenance of national standards.

(a) The areas listed below which were determined by the State of Washington are hereby identified by the Administrator pursuant to § 51.12, paragraphs (e) and (f), of this chapter as having the potential for violation of the specified air quality standards within 10 years. The identified areas consist of the territorial area encompassed by the boundaries of the given jurisdictions or described area including the territorial area of all municipalities (as defined in Section 302(f) of the Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. 1857(h)(f)) geographically located within the outermost boundaries of the area so delimited.

(1) Puget Sound Air Quality Maintenance Area.

(i) Pollutant for which the area is identified: Particulate matter.

(ii) Geographical composition of area:

The Washington State Department of Highways Seattle-Tacoma Urban Area-1972. (A complete geographical description of the area is presented in a map of the Seattle-Tacoma Urban Area-1972 prepared by the Washington State Highway Department and available for inspection at the Freedom of Information Center, U.S. EPA, Room 206, 401 M Street SW., Washington, D.C.; the U.S. EPA Region X Office, 1200 Sixth Avenue, Seattle, Washington; and the Washington Department of Ecology Headquarters Office, St. Martin's College, Olympia, Washington.)

(2) Spokane Air Quality Maintenance Area.

(i) Pollutant for which the area is identified: Particulate matter.

(ii) Geographical composition of area:

Spokane Regional Planning Conference Study Area—1968. (A complete geographical description of the area is presented in the Spokane Metropolitan Area Regional Comprehensive Plan Map, dated October 22, 1968, prepared by the Spokane Regional Planning Conference and available for inspection at the Freedom of Information Center, U.S. EPA, Room 206, 401 M Street SW., Washington, D.C.; the U.S. EPA Region X Office, 1200 Sixth Avenue, Seattle, Washington; and the Washington Department of Ecology Headquarters Office, St. Martin's College, Olympia, Washington.)

(3) Portland-Vancouver Interstate Air Quality Maintenance Area (Washington Portion).

(i) Pollutants for which the area is identified: Particulate matter, sulfur dioxide, carbon monoxide, and photochemical oxidants.

(ii) Geographical composition of area:

The Columbia Region Association of Governments—1970 Portland-Vancouver Metropolitan Transportation Study Area. (A complete geographical description of the area is presented in a map of the 1970 Portland-Vancouver Metropolitan Study Area prepared by the Columbia Region Association of Governments and available for inspection at the Freedom of Information Center, U.S. EPA, Room 206, 401 M Street SW., Washington, D.C.; the U.S. EPA Region X Office, 1200 Sixth Avenue, Seattle, Washington; and the Washington Department of Ecology Headquarters Office, St. Martin's College, Olympia, Washington.

Subpart AAA—Guam

31. Subpart AAA is amended by adding § 52.2674 as follows:

§ 52.2674 Maintenance of national standards.

(a) Based upon the information available to him and in accordance with EPA publication, Guidelines for Designation of Air Quality Maintenance Areas, the Administrator does not identify any areas pursuant to § 51.12, paragraphs (e) and (f), of this chapter as having the potential for violation of national ambient air quality standards within 10 years.

Subpart BBB—Puerto Rico

32. Paragraph (c) of § 52.2720 is revised to read as follows:

§ 52.2720 Identification of plan.

* * * * *

(c) Supplemental information was submitted on:

(1) April 5, 9, and 17, May 30, June 18, and September 10, 1973, and on February 1 and 12, 1974, by the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico Environmental Quality Board;

(2) May 5, 1974.

33. Subpart BBB is amended by adding § 52.2728 as follows:

§ 52.2728 Maintenance of national standards.

(a) The areas listed below are hereby identified by the Administrator pursuant to § 51.12 (e) and (f) of this chapter as having the potential for violation of the specified air quality standards within 10 years. The identified areas consist of the territorial area encompassed by the boundaries of the given jurisdiction or described area including the territorial area of all municipalities (as defined in section 302(f) of the Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. 1857h(f)) geographically located within the outermost boundaries of the area so delimited.

(1) Ponce Air Quality Maintenance Area.

(i) Pollutants for which the area is identified: Particulate matter and sulfur oxides.

(ii) Geographical composition of area:

Ponce Municipality
Juana Diaz Municipality
Villalba Municipality

(2) San Juan Air Quality Maintenance Area.

(i) Pollutants for which the area is identified: Particulate matter and sulfur oxides.

(ii) Geographical composition of area:

San Juan Municipality
Bayamon Municipality
Rio Grande Municipality
Carolina Municipality
Catano Municipality
Guaynabo Municipality
Loiza Municipality
Toa Baja Municipality
Trujillo Alto Municipality

(3) Caguas Air Quality Maintenance Area.

(i) Pollutant for which the area is identified: Particulate matter.

(ii) Geographical composition of area:

Caguas Municipality
Gurabo Municipality
San Lorenzo Municipality

(4) Mayaguez Air Quality Maintenance Area.

(i) Pollutant for which the area is identified: Particulate matter.

(ii) Geographical composition of area:

Mayaguez Municipality
Hormigueros Municipality
Anasco Municipality

(5) Guanica Air Quality Maintenance Area.

(i) Pollutant for which the area is identified: Sulfur oxides.

(ii) Geographical composition of area:

Guanica Municipality

(6) Dorado Air Quality Maintenance Area.

(i) Pollutant for which the area is identified: Sulfur oxides.

(ii) Geographical composition of area:

Dorado Municipality

(7) Guayanilla-Penuelas Air Quality Maintenance Area.

(i) Pollutants for which the area is identified: Particulate matter and sulfur oxides.

(ii) Geographical composition of area:

Guayanilla Municipality
Penuelas Municipality

(8) Lares-Utuado-Adjuntas Air Quality Maintenance Area.

(i) Pollutants for which the area is identified: Particulate matter and sulfur oxides.

(ii) Geographical composition of area:

Lares Municipality
Utuado Municipality
Adjuntas Municipality

(9) Aguadilla Air Quality Maintenance Area.

(i) Pollutants for which the area is identified: Particulate matter and sulfur oxides.

(ii) Geographical composition of area:

Aguadilla Municipality

(10) Arecibo-Barceloneta Air Quality Maintenance Area.

(i) Pollutants for which the area is identified: Particulate matter and sulfur oxides.

(ii) Geographical composition of area:

Arecibo Municipality
Barceloneta Municipality

(11) Guayama Air Quality Maintenance Area.

(i) Pollutants for which the area is identified: Particulate matter and sulfur oxides.

(ii) Geographical composition of area:

Guayama Municipality

(12) Yabucoa Air Quality Maintenance Area.

(1) Pollutants for which the area is identified: Particulate matter and sulfur oxides.

(ii) Geographical composition of area:

Yabucoa Municipality

Subpart CCC—U.S. Virgin Islands

34. Subpart CCC is amended by adding § 52.2778 as follows:

§ 52.2778 Maintenance of national standards.

(a) Based upon information available to him and in accordance with the EPA publication, Guidelines for Designation of Air Quality Maintenance Areas, the Administrator does not identify any areas pursuant to § 51.12, paragraphs (e) and (f), of this chapter as having the potential for violation of national ambient air quality standards within 10 years.

Subpart DDD—American Samoa

35. Subpart DDD is amended by adding § 52.2826 as follows:

§ 52.2826 Maintenance of national standards.

(a) Based upon the information available to him and in accordance with EPA publication, Guidelines for Designation of Air Quality Maintenance Areas, the Administrator does not identify any areas pursuant to § 51.12, paragraphs (e) and (f), of this chapter as having the potential for violation of national ambient air quality standards within 10 years.

[FR Doc.75-11183 Filed 4-28-75;8:45 am]